

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,

Case No. 1:25-cv-00071-CL

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

ELON MUSK; VIVEK RAMASWAMY;
Speaker of the House MIKE JOHNSON; and
the DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT
EFFICIENCY,

Defendants.

KASUBHAI, United States District Judge:

This matter is before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Clarke issued a Findings and Recommendation on June 24, 2025, in which he recommends that this Court dismiss the claim with prejudice. F&R, ECF No. 12. When a party objects to a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendations, the district court must “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the district court has no obligation to review the magistrate judge’s report. *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). However, the district court is not precluded from *sua sponte* review in such circumstances, *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985), and the Advisory Committee notes to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) recommend

that the court should review for “clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P.

72(b) advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment.

Here, no party timely objected to the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation.

The Court has reviewed the record and finds no error.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Clarke’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF No.

12. Plaintiff’s Complaint is therefore DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 31st day of July 2025.

s/ Mustafa T. Kasubhai
MUSTAFA T. KASUBHAI (He / Him)
United States District Judge